No. 331

The Christian News-Letter

Edited by KATHLEEN BLISS

16th February, 1949

NEWS-LETTER

THE MINDSZENTY TRIAL

THE STATE AND EDUCATION

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH'S APPEAL FOR PEACE

SUPPLEMENT

SOME LOCAL ECUMENICAL THINKING

BY

JAMES GRAY

THE TRIAL of Cardinal Mindszenty for treason before a people's court in Budapest has been watched in every part of the world with strong feeling and with growing bewilderment. The sentence of life imprisonment is pronounced upon him as this News-Letter goes to press.

Shortly after his arrest, *The Times* in a leading article commented, " Every act of persecution in eastern Europe broadens the gulf between East and West and makes an eventual conflict between the great powers harder to avoid. To this extent the fate of Cardinal Mindszenty must in the long run be a factor of major diplomatic importance." Spokesmen in the West have on the whole upheld the judgment that the trial is an act of persecution which may have serious international consequences.

In Budapest itself doubts and bewilderment began to grow as the trial proceeded. Could the Cardinal be regarded as a martyr if the charges against him were none of them religious? What could be made of the fact that the Cardinal in court reaffirmed his " confession ", offered to pay damages for infringements of currency laws, admitted that only a few days before he had tried to smuggle a letter to the American Minister, said that if he had his time over again he would have acted differently, and showed none of the marks of a

man intent on sacrificing his life for a cause? These questionings divided and confused opinion in Budapest.

Whatever clouds and darkness surround the proceedings, one fact stands out clearly. The charge of treason against the Cardinal, his confession and the confusion of opinion have given the Hungarian Government just what it wanted. Many other attempts to discredit him and to drive a wedge between him and his clergy and people had been made and failed. He might have been charged, tried and condemned on religious grounds, which would have plainly made him a martyr and so have enhanced his prestige. But the Government was at pains to avoid this risk. The fact that it has secured the result which best suited its purposes, and the savagery of the sentence, inevitably raise the suspicion that the proceedings were rigged, especially when the Cardinal's extraordinary behaviour in court is looked at in the light of the methods of managing trials which Communists are known to use.

It is a horrible reflection on our times that it is easier for an historian to sit down and worry out the truth from a trial five hundred or more years ago than it is for the British Government to discover, in a world bristling with devices for communication, the facts behind a great contemporary trial in another part of Europe. Few can have very high hopes that His Majesty's Government, acting at a distance and already suffering from the disadvantage of not having been allowed to send a diplomatic representative to the trial, can fulfil its obligation as a signatory of the Peace Treaty with Hungary to discover whether there has been a breach of Hungary's commitment to uphold the fundamental human rights and freedoms which was one of the clauses of that Treaty.

The results of suspicions spread abroad and passions roused by this trial are incalculable. From the Vatican and from Catholic spokesmen all over the world comes championship of the Cardinal, varying in degrees of violence. To Cardinal Spellman, U.S.A., Cardinal Mindszenty's trial is another crucifixion—his "torturings and druggings"

need no proof. To Communists the suggestions of such treatment seem absurd. To the ordinary person trying to reach a conclusion on the basis of evidence, the fear of being the victim of hysteria is as great as the fear of being taken in by that same kind of cunning which kept him so long from believing that there were such things as Nazi concentration camps. As passions mount on each side the desire to know the truth is replaced by a readiness to believe anything that fits into an already accepted picture.

Perhaps the best thing that a Christian can do is to try to keep the temperature down, not by saying that what happens in remote Hungary is of little significance, but first by keeping the real issues (which did not appear in the trial) in mind and by offering prayer not only for the Cardinal but for the Hungarian bishops in their conversations with the Government and for the Pope and his advisers as they deal with issues fraught with dire possibilities for the Church and for the world.

THE ISSUES BEHIND THE TRIAL

The fundamental point at issue between Cardinal Mindszenty and the Hungarian Government was the question of education.

(1) When a new Government, hoping to usher in by revolution a new social and economic régime, comes to power, the key to success is the control of education.

On the long view, the only hope of stabilizing the revolution is to bring up the young generation in ideas which will wean them from the ideas of their parents. On the short view, the quickest way of getting key positions into the hands of party members is to make the party ticket a sure and easy means of entry into the universities. This has been happening all over eastern Europe. The Russians in their zone of Germany have taken steps to ensure that all the key positions in the universities, administrative and professorial, will in a few years' time be in the hands of trusted party members now being trained in Moscow. In Hungary, the Ministry of Education already

lays it down that forty-two per cent of university entrants must come from working-class families, and membership of the Communist party is taken as proof of working-class status. In Slovakia, the State nationalized Roman Catholic schools in 1945. In Poland, the control of primary education passed from the Church to the State before the war, but since it was an avowedly Catholic State to which the control passed, the Church was well satisfied; but signs of conflict are already apparent there as the State begins to determine the content of education in accordance with its own ideology.

The situation in Hungary as between Church and State in the matter of schools does not differ from the situation in Great Britain or the United States *solely* because in those countries there are liberal democratic governments and in Hungary there is a Communist government. In Hungary the Roman Catholic Church has been so closely identified with, as to be almost part and parcel of, the outgoing régime in the State. Cardinal Mindszenty saw himself in the line of his predecessors who had played their part in the constitution and in politics. On October 7th, 1945, before the establishment of the Republic, he used the following words at his enthronement: "I cannot as yet enter the arena of our political life, because to-day we sail upon constitutionally unsafe waters. Many a constitutional bastion lies in ruins, but the Primate is still here, ready to step into the footsteps of his predecessors. When the tide of misfortune ebbs and calmness reigns over the waters, I, as your Pontifex, shall take my place in the reconstruction and promotion of our constitutional life." These words have, of course, been used against him, but they do at least make some sense of what he said at his trial about the difficulty of changing a fundamental attitude. Whether he plotted or not, it seems fairly clear that he did regard his office as one of those "bastions of the constitution" to which he referred. This meant, in relation to education, that if the Government was trying to use the schools for its own purposes, the Church also was not clear of the suspicion that behind the issue of religion versus atheism it was trying to preserve a "bastion"

or to act, through the schools, as a sort of shadow-trustee for some other form of government, past or future. As far as it is possible to tell, the Cardinal never made it clear that the Church supported the Republic even while it would fight with all its power the pernicious Communist doctrine that the State equals the party, and that the party may use education to bend the people to its will.

(2) The second point is a sheerly practical one. The equipment needed by the child who goes out into our modern technological society is not such as can be provided by the simple methods of the teaching priest and nun, nor can the Church in any country finance unaided an education which will not leave parents feeling that a religious upbringing has exacted from their children the unjust price of being worse educated than their fellows. For this reason, in the modern State the world over, education has become a subject for prolonged discussion, negotiation and compromise. The place where all parties feel that they have obtained 100 per cent of their requirements simply does not exist.

It is unfortunate, to say the least, that Hungary should have reached the inevitable stage of a growing dissatisfaction with the primitive condition of very many Church schools, just when a political revolution broke upon the country. The Communist government was able to take up a legitimate case against many of the Church schools which has nothing to do with politics or religion—their technical inadequacy. This is again a real issue, overlaid by such passion that it disappears from sight.

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH AND THE WEST

The fury of the opposition between the Roman Catholic Church and Communism, as it finds a focal point in the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, only serves to throw into sharper contrast the peaceful relationships which exist between the Russian Government and the Russian Orthodox Church. Abroad the Russian Government seems to egg on satellite governments to attacks on the Christian Church, while at home the anti-God campaign is no longer vigorously

pursued and churches are full. Last summer the five hundredth anniversary of the independence of the Russian Orthodox Church was celebrated in Moscow, at a great Church Congress presided over by the Moscow Patriarch Alexei. A number of Resolutions were published, one of which took the form of a message to Christians " all over the world, to all men who hunger and thirst after truth and peace with the appeal to listen to our appeal for brotherly love, humanity, justice and truth. . . . We propose to them that we should join together in depriving of their power those who serve the powers of darkness and to whom Christian love and the spirit of reconciliation have lost their meaning." The authors continue, " It pains us deeply that instead of hearing the voice of peace and Christian mercy from the Vatican (the bulwark of Catholicism) and from America (the nest of Protestantism) we hear hymns consecrating a new war, the atom bomb and similar achievements for the destruction of human life. It is our sincere hope and prayer that the Vatican's pride and lust for power, as well as of those who support the Vatican, and the presumption of Protestant rationalism, may be superseded by the spirit of Christian reconciliation."

The general line of comment on this appeal in the West was that the Russian Church, kept in ignorance of what goes on in the world, was being used purely as a mouthpiece of the Communist State. But there is a deeper significance to it than that. This is just the kind of document which the Russian Orthodox Church might have produced without any promptings from the Communist Government, which indeed it might have produced on other occasions in the past. To the Russian Orthodox Church the Roman Catholic Church has for centuries been regarded as the spearhead of attack on Russia from the West, of which Catholic Poland is the chief but not the only example. It therefore needs no prompting from the Russian Government to see in the present struggle between the State and the Roman Catholic Church in Eastern Europe confirmation of age-long fears.

" The struggle between East and West " has become the catchphrase to which different meanings are being

attributed, political, military, and religious. Events like the trial of the Cardinal make more and more people say, " This is primarily a religious struggle, Christendom against godless Communism ". Doubt whether this is a true judgment or serves the cause of Christianity is expressed in the following letter from Dr. Eugene Lampert, commenting on the Russian Church's appeal for peace :—

" The document appears to me to have a great importance. It is a reminder to Christians in the West that there *are* Christians in the East : it is also a reminder of the fact that the two immense forces of Russia and the West find themselves face to face not on the Elbe or in Berlin but in the very depth of European mankind. People in the West, particularly in America and Britain (but much less in France) have become accustomed to oppose ' Christian civilization ' (I should add, perhaps, ' Christian civilization in the straight jacket of Anglo-American atomic might ! ') and Communist Russia. This is increasingly becoming a conventional war-cry on the lips of those who have little awareness of what is meant by either Christian civilization or Communist Russia. I am simply not impressed by this hackneyed attitude, which is fit for military purposes, but, by simplifying, confuses the issue. The Russians are, of course, by no means free from a similar attitude (there are signs of it even in the document of the Moscow Conference), but with them it is largely due to a kind of persecution mania, which, as is well known, easily turns into aggressiveness ; whereas in the West it is the result of the sin of pride, of cultural *hubris*, which issues in what Professor Toynbee calls the posture of the civilized lord of creation. It is perhaps a somewhat tragic comment on our predicament to-day that it is necessary for Western Christians to be reminded that there are Christians in the East. There is no such thing as Western (Christian) civilization *over against* Russian (non-Christian) civilization, and I for one am conscious of the excellence and the tragedy of belonging to a world torn asunder and yet fundamentally one : indeed, it is this very unity, this terrifying one-ness of the historical destiny of European man that makes me embrace and appreciate all our present tensions and conflicts.

"It may be useful to recall the following facts: that Russia is at least as much an heir of Christian 'Second' Rome, and thus of Christian civilization, as Western Europe; that the re-incorporation of Russia into West European society was not, as some make out, the result of a brutal act by Peter the Great, who dragged old Russia gasping and rubbing her eyes out of a barbarous Asia into civilized Christian Europe, but the expression of the great and perennial historic drama of East-and-West; that the whole nineteenth century in Russia was nurtured by a profound and almost passionate European 'patriotism' (cf. Khomiakov, Dostoevsky, Hertzen, Turgenyev, Solovyev, and others); that the October Revolution, however 'Russian' it may have been in some respects, was carried out in the name of Marxism, which is, as Dr. Temple kept on reminding us, a post-Christian, and, in that sense, a Christian phenomenon, and that it is, as Berdyaev pointed out, a living out of the ultimate consequences of European humanism and thus a final manifestation of the fundamental co-inherence of Eastern and Western Christendom. Russia remained a part of Christendom in the very atheism which inspired the Revolution, no less so, if not more, than France did throughout her revolutionary history with its multiform *écrasez l'infame*. . . . I could mention many other illustrations which show that Russia is part and parcel of Christian civilization. I think these considerations indicate the kind of assumptions from which the Russian Church leaders proceeded in their declaration and appeal."

THE SUPPLEMENT

It is often felt that discussions of Church order are remote from local situations. James Gray, Warden of Overdale College, Birmingham, the Theological College of the Disciples of Christ, has acted as scribe for a local group who have tried to begin their thinking at the actual level of experience.

Kathleen Bliss

SOME LOCAL ECUMENICAL THINKING

By JAMES GRAY

PREFATORY NOTE

FOR some months a group of members of staff of the Selly Oak Colleges has been meeting once a week to study questions connected with the Church and the Churches. The special value of the group is that it contains convinced and active members of different Christian traditions. There are Anglicans, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, Quakers, Presbyterians and Disciples of Christ; and they have all spoken with the openness and sincerity which is only possible in a fairly intimate circle whose members have a deep respect and a growing friendship for each other. The fundamental unity in Christ, recognized from the start, has been strongly felt, and its basis more clearly perceived, while the things which continue to divide us have been brought into sharper focus.

The following statement, written by the secretary of the group, has been discussed by the whole group. It would not be true to say that it has received the complete assent of every member of the group; but the measure of agreement reached in so diverse a group has been, we have felt, the work of the Holy Spirit. Individual members would, of course, lay different emphases and prefer other forms of words, and for any defects the writer alone is responsible.

THE STATEMENT

In our thinking about the Church and the Churches, and in our Christian work and worship, we need :—

(*a*) a framework of thought into which our own beliefs and practices and those of our several Churches may fit, not for ever and not too contentedly, but temporarily and usefully;

(*b*) a norm or a criterion, by which beliefs and practices in the Churches may be judged; or an ideal for the future towards which we may set our minds and devote our efforts, an ideal of what God wills the Church to become.

The following notes are an attempt to outline such a framework of thought which has often emerged in the discussions and has perhaps more often been at the back of our minds; an attempt may later be made to suggest the crucial place of the New Testament as the norm we need, and to set down the sense in which the authority of the Bible is modified or interpreted by the recognition of the authority of the Church and of the Inner Light.

(1) In the events recorded in the Bible, culminating in Christ, we have revealed to us God's purpose for men and His method in achieving it. Old Israel was chosen by God as the instrument for fulfilling God's purpose to bring salvation to the world. Christ came to Israel, but His own received Him not, and He founded the New Israel. In His own Person and work He accepted the rôle of the Suffering Servant of God to bring redemption to the world. Death and Resurrection were the essence of His ministry; and the New Israel, the Church, His Body, was called to bear witness to the suffering and triumphant Saviour, and also to partake of His sufferings and His new life. The Lord said: "As the Father hath sent me, so send I you". The Apostle Paul said: "I make up that which is lacking of the sufferings of Christ in my flesh, for His Body's sake, which is the Church".

(2) The Christian Church exists to give glory and worship to God, but it exists also to be God's instrument, witnessing to Christ and becoming the channel used by God to bring salvation —health and wholeness and new life—to the world. This salvation is life in Christ: it includes the filial relationship of individuals to God as Father; but this relationship is wrongly conceived if it is thought of as possible or actual without the community which is the family of God. Every person becoming a Christian does so because of the influence and testimony of other Christians, as part of the Body. We have nothing that we have not received: how can we hear without the preacher, or the witness, who need not be in a pulpit? We apprehend any aspect or dimension of the love of Christ not by ourselves but "with all the saints". And just as the fellowship is a party to all individual *apprehension*, so too there can be no *growth* in understanding

or in grace apart from the fellowship. In this sense surely we must all agree that *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus* (" Outside the Church there is no salvation ") and perhaps we ought to amend it (mixing Latin and Greek) *Extra koinonian nulla salus* (" Outside the Fellowship there is no salvation ").

(3) The Church, the Body of Christ, is not purely spiritual, but has, so to speak, a bony structure with an element of definiteness and even rigidity about it. If we have rightly expressed God's purpose in the brief statement above, we should expect that the bony structure of the Body would be designed by God to further the purpose for which He created the Body; or, if devised by men under God's guidance (in that mysterious and delicate co-operation of man with God which is manifest also in the inspiration of the Scriptures), we should expect to find the bony structure adapted to its Divine purpose.

We cannot afford to despise this structural element, though those of us who emphasize spontaneity and the freedom of the Spirit are always in danger of doing so. We tend to dismiss as " merely formal " the liturgical form of service, the rites connected with sacramental observance; we tend to depreciate as unspiritual the laying on of hands, or as mechanical the belief in Apostolic succession; while rarely recognizing that there is an element of structure and form in the hearty singing of hymns—formal verse pattern and formal melody and harmony—as there is also structure and form in the spare and sober Quaker Meeting beginning at 11 a.m. on the First Day of the week and ending at noon.

This could be illustrated very freely. The point is that the Church's mission in the world necessarily involved, and involves still, *some structure*, *some forms*, of matter, of worship, of institution—if God's purpose is to be fulfilled.

Hebert[1] makes a distinction between two senses of the word " form ": (i) " the form is the shape or pattern of a thing; it is thus readily used of an outward shape which no longer expresses an inner vitality ". (ii) " corresponds rather to Aristotle's use

[1] *The Form of the Church*, p. 9. (Faber, 1944, 8s. 6d.)

of the word as that which makes a thing to be what it is, to mould or shape the matter of which it is also composed, so that the growth of the thing towards the fullness or perfection of its being is the actualization of its form". In the former sense the form is thought of as separate from the thing, and is distinguished from the life; in the latter sense the form is immanent in the thing, and gathers up in itself the whole essence and meaning of the thing. No Aristotelian or scholastic thinker would ever apply the adjective "mere" to the noun "form".

Yet it must also be said that the bony structure and the forms connected with it in the developing Church were designed to express and symbolize God's purpose and gift in Jesus Christ, and to bring to men the Divine life—i.e., to express the Gospel and to make it available in life and power for men. Therefore the formal, structural, institutional, ritual elements in the Church must always be held under judgment—man's and God's—for *they are subordinate to God's holy purpose.*

Let us recognize further that all our Churches, whatever the particular circumstances and date of their origin, have in fact inherited or developed such forms. Must we not all agree that such forms must be judged, in the last resort, by their power and effectiveness in doing these two things: (*a*) *they must express the Gospel of Christ*, and (*b*) *they must bring men into the Divine life*?

There is value in continuity with an age-long tradition, and that continuity is an assertion of an integral part of the Gospel of Christ, namely, that the Church is a Body not now emerging for the first time, but including the saints of all generations, and that there is substantial identity in it through all ages. But insistence on continuity and identity of this sort cannot without serious danger be carried beyond the point where the structure and the formal sameness has ceased to mediate the Divine life.

Baptism in its New Testament use was not divorced from the Christian quality of life—it was the effective symbol of the death and resurrection of Christ, His life being here and now made available to the penitent believer committing himself to the service of his Lord. Its whole action, its whole form, was designed to express the Gospel and to convey its grace. The baptized believer rose to walk in newness of life; henceforth

he was bearing about in his body the dying of the Lord Jesus, so that the life also of Jesus might be manifested in his body.

So too *the Lord's Supper* was intended both to express the essential facts of the Gospel of Christ, and to make the Divine life available for those who shared the Feast. The action of the Feast, with its breaking of the Bread and its pouring of the Wine, inescapably dominates the thought and feeling of the believers at worship; nothing could more clearly focus attention on the dying of Christ, and nothing could more surely express the fact that through this death we have life, that this Body was broken for us, this Blood shed for us.

So too it is possible to expound the significance of the *Christian Ministry* in similar terms: the ministry exists not only to proclaim the Word of God faithfully, but to witness to its central truths by sacrificial service and shepherding, by mediating thus the love of God, shown forth supremely in Him who above all other ministers is the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls.

This expression of the Gospel by the ministry applies to all kinds of ministers and would be regarded as the great function of the ministry by upholders of diverse types of Church government. That the universal ministry witnesses to the one-ness of the whole Body of Christ, to its continuity throughout all Christian ages, which is an essential element in the Gospel, is one of the main arguments urged on behalf of Episcopacy; but it is not easy for members of non-Episcopal Churches to feel convinced that Episcopacy is the only form of ministry which maintains or could maintain a witness to this particular element of the Gospel.

The two Sacraments and the Ministry, as some of the more important *forms* of the Church, may in this way be seen as expressing the Gospel, and deriving their function in God's purpose from their power to bring the Divine life to men.

May we not agree that *all* the *forms* used in our Churches must be subjected to this kind of test or criterion?

(4) These elements of structure in the Church are not put there arbitrarily but in order that the Body may live and function and

express the Gospel and convey its life to men. Yet when this bony structure loses its life-giving power, becomes a skeleton, or a " mere form " ; when its adherents show little or no sign of the spiritual regeneration and the fruits of it, for which the structure exists—what then ? Not only can we understand, but surely we must approve, Luther's recoil from a theory and practice of sacraments and indulgences which had no counterpart in spiritual reality. We can understand the Quakers throwing over the outward form entirely, and laying hold of the spiritual reality for which the outward forms were supposed to exist, when they found baptized members of the Church of England not only sinning (we all sin) but lacking any strenuous effort to follow Christ in daily life, and even making no effort to share in the fellowship and worship of the Church. So with other reformers. There may come a point at which reformers are compelled to assert a truth which the Church as a whole has neglected, and this assertion may lead either to their leaving the main body of the Church or to their being expelled from it ; and it is always difficult, when such a split comes, to apportion the exact degree of responsibility or blame.

William Temple once put it in this way : " The corruption (of the Church) has sometimes gone so far that to the best men of the time it has seemed necessary, if witness was to be given to the grace of God at all, that it should be given in separation from the body as it had come to be ; for this body smothered the Spirit which it existed to manifest. At the Reformation, in particular, the first great Reformers would gladly have preached their freshly apprehended truth within the Catholic Church ; but the authorities of that Church would not permit their preaching of it at all. No doubt there were grave faults in the Reformers also, which gave to the authorities an occasion for repressive action. But it does not seem to me possible to doubt that the Reformers were bound by loyalty to Christ to preach the truth in Him as they had newly come to know it, and if that could not be inside the unity of the Church, then it must be outside. So there were formed new fellowships of Christians in fellowship with one another."[1]

[1] *Thoughts on Some Problems of the Day*, pp. 108–109. (Macmillan, 1931.)

(5) Here we are, then, in our separate fellowships, each one of s seeing that part of God's purpose and those aspects of the ody of Christ which our tradition has opened our eyes to prehend.

Yet we acknowledge, and must continually recognize, that e are one-eyed, seeing all things through our own special pectacles, in our "ego-centric predicament", and in our own roup-centric predicament; seeing and saying what we do ecause of the circumstances of our personal history and our enominational history. We recognize that it is historically evitable that the splinter body should emphasize the things on hich it split, and that the old "block", so to speak, should mphasize its own position, seek to safeguard its own future and olidarity, and consequently must anathematize the splinter and l its works. So the gulf is widened and each is hardened in s limited vision and fixed in its own limitation.

Illustrations of this pathetic truth come flocking to the mind. ongregationalists have exaggerated the significance of inde- ndency and neglected the importance of the wholeness of the ne Body of the universal Church—because of the need for aintaining a witness that was historically necessary when ndependency was a principle to be fought for against a worldly tional Church. Quakers have undervalued the significance outward forms and sacraments because they became a separate dy through the necessity of witnessing to the spiritual nature the Gospel and of repudiating outward forms which had ased to mediate the life of the Spirit of God. Baptists and urches of Christ have felt so keenly that *Infant* Baptism is an use of a true Sacrament that their witness on behalf of *Believers'* ptism has loomed far larger than it ever should do in a well- roportioned exposition of the Christian faith.

So too on the Catholic side of Christianity, the formal elements the Gospel, especially the doctrine of Apostolic Succession d Episcopacy, have received disproportionate emphasis; and nce this is not often publicly acknowledged, let me quote mple again, as he freely admitted the fact: "Every division, rough the very controversy which causes it and to which it terwards gives occasion, leads each of the separated bodies

to pay exaggerated attention to the points about which differences arose. Thus, to take the example nearest home, I am convinced that the Anglican Communion is right to maintain its insistence on the Historic Episcopate, but I am equally convinced that Anglicans think far too much—not necessarily too highly, but assuredly too often and too long—of that same Episcopate. It would be far better for us if we could take it for granted and give our undistracted thought to other matters."[1]

In the meantime we must go on sharing that part of the life of the Body which mediates God effectively to us, ever being wary of the temptation to change to some other branch of the Church out of novelty or the sudden impulse of a new vision of God's truth. Yet it is great gain if we can all deeply accept the fact of the limitation of our vision, the partial quality of our understanding of the fullness of the Gospel. It enables us to do all we can to purify and cleanse our own and our Church's position from un-Christian elements. It enables us to beware of judging other traditions at their worst and presenting our own at its best; and it helps us to see the danger of concluding that the abuse by others of a means of grace is an adequate reason for our rejecting it entirely.

The extension of this point of view among all Christians seems to me to be a prime obligation on all who care for the unity of the Body of Christ and the salvation of mankind. If it became a part of every Christian's habit of mind, if it were to occupy the centre of the thinking of Church leaders of every denomination, there would be far more prospect than is at present visible of real reunion.

[1] Op cit., pp. 89–90.

Subscriptions—£1 ($4.00 in U.S.A. and Canada) for one year, 10s. 6d. for six months (Great Britain and Ireland only). Single copies, 10d.; reduction for quantities.

Indices—Vols. I—XIII (Oct. 1939—Dec. 1948), 1s. each post free.

Folders—To hold six months' supply, 3s. each post free.

Bound Volumes—Vols. II—XII (May 1940—Dec. 1947) 15s. each post free, or 12s. 6d. each in sets of four or more consecutive volumes.

All communications and subscriptions should be sent to—
THE CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, 20 BALCOMBE STREET, DORSET SQUARE, LONDON, N.W. 1

Published by the Christian Frontier Trust, Ltd., and printed in Great Britain by the Church Army Press, Cowley, Oxford.